Milton Township Inventory of Public Access Sites/Road Ends

Local Government and Watershed Protection Forum

March 19, 2014

Chris Weinzapfel

Zoning Administrator

Ratings

- During the summer of 2013, 7 members of the MT Parks and Recreation Committee assessed the 33 road ends and public access sights in the Township, which has shorelines on East Bay, Torch Lake, Torch River, Lake Skegemog and Elk Lake.
- They used a common rating form that included:
  - Description/purpose of the site
  - Adjacent landowner information
  - Access to water – uses, ramps, docks, barriers to access
  - Parking and signage
  - Infrastructure – facilities
  - Erosion – degree of severity
  - Greenbelt – description

MILTON TOWNSHIP

PUBLIC ACCESS/ROAD END ASSESSMENT

SUMMER 2013

#6 (1) SITE ID: Public Park Elk Lake DR.

(2) PARCEL ID: _____

(3) DATE: July 15, 2013

(4) EVALUATED BY: Kevin Hoch

(5) WATERBODY NAME: ☒ LAKE Elk Lake
☐ RIVER _____
☐ BAY _____

(6) OWNER: ☒ MILTON ☐ ANTRIM CRC ☐ OTHER _____

(7) GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PURPOSE OF SITE (BRIEFLY EXPLAIN):
Grass area - Picnic, swim area

- WATER FRONTAGE WIDTH (FT): 66'
- GROUND COVER (GRASS, GRAVEL, PAVED, BRUSH, ETC): Grass
- ACCESSIBLE FOR FIRE TRUCK PUMP[1] (SEE FOOTNOTE) ☐ YES ☒ NO

(8) ADJACENT LANDOWNER(S) INFORMATION
None

- DESCRIPTION:
Public Park, Beach, Picnic
- FENCING: ☒ YES ☐ NO
- OTHER BARRIERS (BRIEFLY DESCRIBE):

(9) ACCESS TO WATER: ☒ YES ☐ NO

- CAN BE USED FOR: ☒ SWIMMING ☐ BOAT LAUNCH ☒ FISHING ☒ BEACH
- SITE ACCESSIBLE TO DISABLED PEOPLE? ☐ YES ☒ NO
- STAIR ACCESS: ☐ YES ☒ NO
- BARRIERS TO ACCESS ☒ YES ☐ NO (PLEASE DESCRIBE ANY):
Split Fence
- DOCK: ☐ YES ☒ NO HOW MANY? _____
- BOAT RAMP ☐ YES ☒ NO HOW MANY? _____
  - WIDTH (FT): _____
  - PAVED: ☐ YES ☐ NO
  - CONDITION: _____

[1] To accommodate fire department water truck, the access must allow for a 30 ft hose, extended off the truck, to reach a minimum water depth of 1.5 ft.

MILTON TOWNSHIP

PUBLIC ACCESS/ROAD END ASSESSMENT

SUMMER 2013

(10) PARKING: ☒ROADSIDE ☐ OFF ROAD/HOW MANY___ (☒GRASS ☐GRAVEL ☐PAVED)

(11) SIGNAGE: ☒YES ☐NO

- HOW MANY: 1
- SIGN READS: Milton Township Park Annex Dawn to Dusk

(12) INFRASTRUCTURE:

☒PICNIC TABLES 2
☒GRILLS 1
☒SHELTER Pavilion
☒OTHER Bench

(13) GREENBELT SPACE (Unpaved Land Above Avg High Water Line)

- LENGTH (FT) _____ AVG DEPTH (FT)_____
- SURFACE: ☐TURF__% ☐TREES/BRUSH__% ☐STONE/COBBLE__% ☐SAND__%

(14) EROSION ☐YES ☒NO

- EROSION OBSERVED FROM: ☐ROAD ☐SHOULDER ☐BOTH
- SEVERITY: ☐LIGHT ☐MODERATE ☐SEVERE
- ROAD SURFACE: ☐PAVED ☐GRAVEL ☐GRASS/WEEDS ☐ OTHER_____
- BRIEFLY DESCRIBE:
- APPROXIMATE GRADIENT FROM ROAD TO WATER:_____°
- EROSION CONTROL EFFORTS: ☐YES ☐NO ☐UNCERTAIN
- DESCRIBE BRIEFLY:

PLEASE EMAIL PHOTOS OR ATTACH SKETCHES. 3

END

Improvement Rankings

- Sites were assigned a ranking/category of 1 -4, indicating the potential for enhancements to the sites:
  - Category 1 – Currently functional, no improvements needed
  - Category 2 – Minimal public investment could enhance the usability of the site
  - Category 3 – Substantial public investment could enhance the usability of the site
  - Category 4 – Minimal potential for improvements

Lessons Learned

- There was not a common definition for some terms or shared understanding that led to inconsistencies and difficulties in interpretation, especially as related to erosion & greenbelts.
- So, we should have visited one or two sites as a team to develop common understanding of terms and a more standardized approach
- Follow-up on all sites was conducted in November by Committee member, Zoning Administrator, and County Erosion Control Officer to assess erosion and greenbelts – to assure consistency among all sites.

Road End Evaluation

Location_____

Watershed area: _____

Length of contributing slope: _____

Slope of contributing watershed:_____

Cover type of contributing area (CN):_____

_____

Soils of contributing area:_____

Point of discharge:

- **Culvert (size):**_____
- **Ditch (length, depth, width:**_____
- **Sheet flow:**_____

Type:

- **Road end** ☐
- **Boat access** ☐
- **Kayak access** ☐
- **Foot traffic** ☐
- **Other** ☐

Area of lake access:_____

Vegetated: **yes** ☐ **no** ☐

Grass/natural area:

_____

Buffer: **yes** ☐ **no** ☐

Erosion: **yes** ☐ **no** ☐

- **Sheet:**
- **Rill:**
- **Gully:**
- **Dimensions:**

Shoreline erosion: **yes** ☐ **no** ☐

- **Fetch**_____
- **Lake bottom:**_____
- **Depth at 25'** _____
- **Bank height:**_____
- **Slope at bank:**_____

Issues at site: _____

Antrim County Soil Survey
Clinometer
Tape measure
Clip board
Compass
Camera

Erosion Ratings (selection)

Site	Erosion N- None Min – Minimal Mod – Moderate S - Severe	Priority / Project Scale H- High M – Medium L – Low 1 – Major project 2 – Minor project 3 – Repair & Maintain	Greenbelt* 1 – Adequate 2 – Minimal 3 – Enhance, when conducting erosion project
75 LAKE AVE ACCESS	Mod – storm water	M/2	2
37 RINGLER RD	Min	L/3	2
65 TORCH RIVER BRIDGE DNR SIDE	S	H/1	2
INDIAN RD ACCESS	S	H/1	3
77 HAMMOND	Min	L/2	2
76 STOVER AVE ACCESS	Mod	M/2	2
75 RICE AVE ACCESS	Mod	M/2	2
ERICKSON ROAD	Mod	H/3	1
CEDAR WAY ROAD (WAS 1ST AVE IN HBS)	Min	L/3	2
PINETREE LANE ROAD END (WAS 2ND AVE IN HBS)	Min	L/3	2

Table (selection from Milton Township Parks and Recreation Plan.)

Site ID	Waterbody	Water front-age width	Accessible for fire truck pump	Access to water	Accessible to disabled people	Swimming	Beach	Fishing	Kayak	Boat launch	Improvement ranking*	Erosion Control Priority & Project Type**
BUSSA	ELK LAKE	66'	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	1	L/3
CAMPBELL RD	TORCH	66'	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	1	M/2
CEDAR WAY	TORCH	30'	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	2	L/3
CHERRY AVE	ELK LAKE	16'	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2	
CHIPPEWA TRAIL	SKEGAMOG	66-100'	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1	L/3
EASLEY	ELK LAKE	66'	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	2	L/3
ELK LAKE DR	ELK LAKE	66'	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	NA
ELK LAKE DR BOAT RAMP	ELK LAKE	30'	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	1	NA
ERICKSON RD	GT EAST		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	0	H/3
FAIRMONT	SKEGAMOG	66'	Y	Y	N ?	Y	Y	N	N	Y	1	L/3
HAMMOND	TORCH	48'	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	2	L/2
HICKEN RD	TORCH	66'	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	3	M/2

Priority List of Road End Public Access Sites for Improvement
Milton Township

Name	Erosion Level/Priority/Project Scale	Improvement Rank*	Overall Priority
Waring Rd Launch	Severe/High/Major	1	1
Sutter Rd.	Severe/High/Major	2	2
Indian Rd.	Severe/High/Major	2	2
Stover Rd	Mod/Med/Minor	2	4
Rice Ave.	Mod/Med/Minor	2	4
Hoopher Rd	Mod/Med/Minor	2	4
Kewadin Launch	Severe/High/Major	1	7
Erickson Rd	Mod/High/Repair	1	8
Pine Tree Ln	Min/Low/Repair	2	9
Cedar Way	Min/Low/Repair	2	9
Easley Rd	Min/Low/Repair	2	9
Winters Rd	Mod/Med/Repair	1	12
Lake Ave	Mod/Med/Minor	1	13
Hicken Rd	Mod/Med/Minor	3	14
Severence Rd	Mod/Med/Minor	3	14

* 1 - no improvement needed, 2 – minimal investment to improve, 3 – substantial investment to improve, 4 minimal potential for improvement

Next Steps

- Revisit as a group the top six sites and re-rank them from 1 – to 4 (Waring Road will be addressed by mid-May)
- Estimates of cost will be made for each of the highest ranked sites to fix erosion, provide enhancements to improve usability
- Enhance greenbelts at selected sites as recommended by the County Erosion Control Officer
- Go as far down the list each year as budget allows
- Also, apply for grants that will speed up the improvement process